REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the present application in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims.

In the present reply, claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 have been amended. Claims 6-8 stand allowed (see paragraph 2, page 2 of the outstanding Office Action). Thus, claims 1-8 are pending in the present application.

No new matter has been added by way of these amendments, since each claim amendment is supported by the present specification and/or is editorial in nature. For instance, the amendment to claim 1 has support in the present specification at page 4. Further, the amendment to claim 3 has support at page 6. Also, the amendment to claim 4 is supported at page 2 of the specification. Finally, the amendment to claim 5 corrects the preamble so as to properly depend on claim 4, and is a clarifying and not a narrowing amendment.

The amendment to the present specification corrects a typographical error and does not add new matter.

Based upon the above considerations, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the only rejection and allow the currently pending claims.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Araki *et al.* '150 (U.S. Patent No. 5,986,150). Applicants respectfully traverse, and reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited Araki '150 fails to disclose all features as instantly claimed. Applicants first refer the Examiner to pending claims 1-5 as presented. As can be seen, the pending claims are not within the disclosure of Araki '150. Thus, Araki '150 fails to disclose or recognize the polymer or homopolymer of each of disputed claims 1-5. Because "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," the cited Araki '150 reference cannot be a basis for a rejection under § 102(e). *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Thus, because of the lack of disclosure of all features as instantly claimed, the rejection in view of Araki '150 is overcome.

Applicants also submit that the instant claims are patentable over the cited Araki '150 reference under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). A *prima facie* case of obviousness could not be established, since there is no disclosure of claimed features. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d, 488, 493, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1442 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Accordingly, based on the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

With the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the claims, as they now stand, define patentable subject matter such that a passage of the instant invention to allowance is warranted. A Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Eugene T. Perez (Reg. No. 48,501) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
Andrew D. Meikle, #32,868

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

ADM/ETP
0020-4902P

(Rev. 02/12/2004)